

**REMARKS**

Claims 105, 106, 108, 124, 125, 127-130, 132-135, 165 and 166 remain pending after response.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter of claims 105, 106, 108, 135, 165 and 166. In view of this indication of allowable subject matter, as well as the above amendments to the claims, it is believed that all pending claims are now directed to allowable subject matter.

***Claim Amendments***

By this amendment, editorial revisions are made to claims 106, 108, 124, 125, 127-130, 132-134 and 165. For instance, claims 132-134 are now dependent upon claim 130 as opposed to claim 124 to correct an inadvertent error in the dependency of those claims. No new matter is added by this amendment. The above claim amendments are now believed to place the claims in condition for allowance.

***Examiner Interview***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended toward its representative during the interview of August 11, 2009. During the interview, the above claim amendments were discussed. As a result of the interview, the Examiner indicated that the above amendments would overcome all outstanding objections and rejections of the claims, and that the amendment

would be entered for such purpose. The application is accordingly believed to be in condition for allowance.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 106, 108, 124, 125, 127-130, 132-134 and 165 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

In response, the objectionable claims are amended in a manner which is believed to overcome the objection. The objection is accordingly believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 USC 112 (paragraph two)***

Claims 124, 125, 127-130 and 132-134 are rejected under 35 USC 112 (paragraph two) as not distinctly claiming the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed to the extent deemed to apply to the claims as amended.

In response, the claims are amended in a manner which is believed to overcome the rejection. The rejection is thus believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)***

Claims 124, 125, 127-130, and 132-134 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jackson** in view of **Riley et al**, **Klampfer et al**, **Wawretschek et al**, **Herschler '421**, **Herschler '039** , **DE 2457424**, **EP 0511895**, **Maramag et al**, and **Memnon et al**. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner notes at page 10 of the Action that the rejection has been maintained as to the dependent claims for the reason that “the claims appear to be broader in scope than the claim 105”.


As the dependent claims are amended in a manner which is believed to address this issue, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

The application is now in condition for allowance. Allowance of claims directed to the generic invention is believed proper.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3828 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCY, GEISSLER, OLDS & LOWE PLLC

By  \_\_\_\_\_  
James W. Hellwege, #28,808

Muncy, Geissler, Olds & Lowe, PLLC  
P.O. Box 1364  
Fairfax, Virginia 22038-1364  
703-621-7140